Supreme Court, U.S.
FILED
DEC 6 1994
OFFICE OF THE CLERK

(4)

No. 94-779

IN THE

SUPREME COURT OF THE UNITED STATES

October Term, 1994

Robert B. LeBlanc; Joan S. LeBlanc,

Jointly And Severally,

Petitioners,

v.

WARD LAKE DRILLING, INC.,

Respondent.

On Petition For Writ Of Certiorari To The

United States Court Of Appeals

For The Sixth Circuit

PETITIONERS' REPLY TO BRIEF IN OPPOSITION

By: Robert B. LeBlanc, Pro Se

On behalf of himself and his wife Joan

9300 Island Drive, Grosse Ile

Michigan 48138 (313) 675 - 0323

7 pp

TABLE OF CONTENTS

	Page(s)
Table of Authorities	ii
Introduction	1-2
Objections and Argument:	
I. A WRIT SHOULD ISSUE IN LIGHT OF WARD LAKE'S ADMISSIONS, TACIT AND/ OR OTHERWISE.	2-4
Conclusion	4

TABLE OF AUTHORITIES

Page(s)

Rules

Federal Rules of Civil Procedure

Rule 8(d) 2

Rules of the Supreme Court

Rule 15.6 2

Statutes

Federal

28 U.S.C. § 1359 3

State

Michigan Compiled Law (M.C.L.)

M.C.L. 554.281 3

No. 94-779

In The

SUPREME COURT OF THE UNITED STATES

October Term, 1994

Robert B. LeBlanc; Joan S. LeBlanc,

Jointly And Severally,

Petitioners.

v.

WARD LAKE DRILLING, INC.,

Respondent.

On Petition For Writ Of Certiorari To The United States Court Of Appeals For The Sixth Circuit

PETITIONERS' REPLY TO BRIEF IN OPPOSITION

To the Honorable, the Chief Justice and Associate Justices of the Supreme Court of the United States of America:

Petitioners', Robert B. LeBlanc; Joan S. LeBlanc (LeBlancs), Jointly and Severally in propria persona, respectfully present

objections with their Reply to Brief in Opposition pursuant to authority of Rule 15.6 of the Supreme Court. Certain key admissions, already having been previously made by Respondent WARD LAKE DRILLING, INC. (Ward Lake), further demonstrate reasons why a Writ of Certiorari should be granted by this Court.

I. A WRIT SHOULD ISSUE IN LIGHT OF WARD LAKE'S ADMISSIONS, TACIT AND/OR OTHERWISE.

Ward Lake failed to answer the LeBlancs Counter-Complaint (dated March 16, 1992), and therefore, under authority of Rule 8(d) of the Federal Rules of Civil Procedure, Ward Lake remains bound by the doctrine of estoppel by record from denying all of its said previous admissions.

Ward Lake's act of invoking the Federal District Court's jurisdiction by filing

its so-called "motion for remand" when viewed together with Ward Lake's failure to file an answer to the LeBlancs Counter-Complaint, thereby results with the consequence of Ward Lake improperly and collusively making itself a party contrary to 28 U.S.C. § 1359 and M.C.L. 554.281; at the very least.

Still, a good faith effort or attempt was made by the LeBlancs in the months of April/May, 1993, so as to initiate negotiations with Ward Lake so as to get the entire matter resolved and settled out of court. Ward Lake made its own choice of deciding to continue to pursue the matter in court.

Shortly thereafter, the State of Michigan's Department of the Attorney General sought concurrence to intervene as a Defendant. The State of Michigan received

only Ward Lake's consent to intervene. The LeBlancs prudently and expressly withheld consent to the State of Michigan's intervention primarily because of said State's already existing "conflicts of interest".

CONCLUSION

For the foregoing reasons, the LeBlancs do respectfully request that this Court should grant a Writ of Certiorari to review.

Respectfully submitted,

By: Robert B. LeBlanc, Pro Se
On behalf of himself and his spouse, Joan
Jointly and Severally Petitioners'
9300 Island Drive
Grosse Ile, Michigan 48138
(313) 675 - 0323